

TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES PROJECT WRITTEN COMMENTS FROM THE SUMMIT

Summit Exercise #1: *Are we faced with a crisis, or not? What is at risk?*

- I don't want Clark County to look like San Fernando Valley, ever. I left Southern California, too, because of the unending growth there.
- The challenge will be to hang in for long enough to get the job done! Very talented group could not come up with silver bullet. This is a hard, complex task and will not be done quickly.
- We do have an impending crisis for the low-income citizens and businesses of this county. Unless we maintain adequate bus service, these people have no means to get to their jobs and therefore be self-sufficient. And businesses won't have an adequate number of workers.
- What did we dream? We have a transportation problem.
- Car-oriented development and the car culture are in large part responsible for our obesity epidemic and the high incidence of Type 2 diabetes.
- Traffic is so bad at Cascade Park that we need to come up with some solutions.
- The crisis is now. It will take too long to respond to the current difficulties. The outlook for the next five years is bleak.
- Considering the current attitude regarding transportation, I suggest we won't get action until the system fails. Then it will be too late.
- No one talks about global warming, but it is a real concern, with the record temperatures we've had the last several days. We have a moral obligation to the world to reduce our contribution to greenhouse gasses.
- Need to address lack of awareness of crisis.
- Be realistic about Americans' love of their cars. It's freedom of movement beyond a means to/from work, taking children to day care, grocery shopping, and many more.
- World-class cities have well-developed mass transit.
- Communicate with other regions to find out what they have tried (has it worked or not) to look at solutions and not duplicate something that has not worked.

- I have 140 signatures and impact statements to get a traffic signal at NE 10th Ave & 199th St. (Shorts's corner).
- Decision tools need to include a comprehensive needs vs. system components analysis:

	Residents	Bus/Comm	Edu-Related	Etc.
Highways				
Bus Lane		Assessed Needs		
Light Rail				
Commuter Rail				
Etc.				

- Freight mobility is essential for jobs and economic development. Consider rail and perhaps road access, particularly for freight, out SR-501 around Vancouver Lake. This would allow the Port to grow and create jobs and get a great deal of freight off of the I-5 bridge and out of downtown.
- Project management – speeding up projects to get the benefits to the public quicker.
Burn rate → implementation
 - Private sector involvement
 - 7.1 Hwy has been audited
 - Unfunded mandates (no \$ behind)
 - You get what you pay for
- Transit Centers / Community Centers – Government facilities should be co-located with transit centers (e.g., post offices, libraries).
- System support has fallen way behind system demand – incremental measures and system controls will not make a significant difference and bridge the gap. We need to transform the system considering the full scope of resources and demands.
- Eliminate concurrency requirements.
- Scrap concurrency – an unacceptable handcuff on economic development, given the defeat of R-51.
- Much of what is done in development and improvement of local road systems is driven by the concurrency requirement of the Growth Management Act (GMA). The ability to fund concurrency is now waning. What would be the impact on local road funding if concurrency was eliminated by the legislature?
- We need a third bridge north of Woodland or at Woodland connecting Silicon Valley west of Bonita Road – Hillsboro – Clark County tech plants – Port of Vancouver – Port of Kalama.

- More aggressive regional economic development and expansion strategy: Work with local colleges to train people for the jobs needed here – there would be less need to import people for jobs.
- Next steps:
 - More public input – statistically valid cross-section.
 - Develop prioritized list of projects with regional (Clark County-wide) and local significance + support (public).
 - Develop funding package for Countywide vote with projects of benefit to all communities.
 - Must be a plan/process to show accountability. How are the jurisdictions going to demonstrate they did what they said they would on the funding ballot measure?
- Ongoing continuation of these forums at a local community level to make sure local safety priorities are considered along with large project prioritization (e.g., traffic light vs. additional freeway lane).
- Developing a regional transportation system plan seems to be a good idea. We need a plan that defines projects for a BALANCED (roads, transit, bike/ped, etc.) system and links funding phases to specific project lists. Seek funding for phased lists, deliver the projects, then proceed with similar process for future phases. Jurisdictions must coordinate to do this successfully.
- Spend transportation money, giving everyone/household in Clark County hybrid vehicles. Less money they have to spend on vehicles, less work they need, more people at home, no dependence on oil, no air pollution, etc.
- Convert HOV to HOT lanes.
- Allow empty taxi/livery vehicles to use HOV for pickup trip.
- Promote HOV use by facilitating SUV's to pick up riders (VDOT Slug Program).
- Get the federal government (Congress) to release funding from set-aside trust funds for rail, ports and airports.
- Find new ways to get people out of cars for short trips and to travel with others for longer trips. An educational campaign to change culture. Change transportation planning paradigm away from more roads.
- I live in Battle Ground and I know that it is the most frequently growing area in Clark County. The transportation in Battle Ground going east to west is terrible at times. With the growing population and the already crowded streets, I believe that traffic lights and street widening are the answer to the traffic problems in Battle Ground. Timed traffic

lights, especially around the high school, would be the way to go. Past the Fred Meyer, the street needs to be widened from one to possibly two or three lanes.

- Transportation demand – we should provide incentives for people to live close to work. This will lessen the demand for transportation. It will also reduce sprawl.
- Regionalization is a good idea, as long as we can prevent Tim Eyman from overriding any tax increases we vote for.
- Strict enforcement of speed limit laws on local streets. This makes it safer for bicyclists. This will really work to slow down traffic (this has worked in the Seattle area).
- Think about programs through mature learning program at Clark College that focus on local issues like transportation.
- End the initiative process in Washington or at least require a 2/3 majority for all initiatives. That is why we have a representative government, to make these decisions. I'd rather put my political energies into getting good candidates elected, not fighting bad initiatives.
- Continue this study with an organized advocacy group to help see these ideas to fruition.
- I think TPP needs to work to get a TRUE sample of our population. The Forum/Summit has an audience that does not represent the entire population. However, the whole process is solid.
- It could be eye-opening if we were to hold a summit without any elected officials, etc. Citizens only; range of level of “informed” vs. “uninformed” citizens.
- Model C-Tran after Seattle's bus transit system. Toxic fuel replaced by electric power.
- Replace large buses in residential areas with vans that carry less people to reduce negative impacts.
- Education, education, education is the answer, especially at grassroots level – employers, labor, schools, community, etc.
- If it isn't broken, don't fix it!
- Cannot separate land use decisions and transportation decisions. How can we more proactively align long-range and current planning with transportation?
- Don't let congestion choke out our future mobility. Don't keep lower LOS standards on the major corridors. This only blocks our future ability to move goods and people in the future.

- Convince commercial business to give discounts to customers that come to shop on bicycles.
- Little was said about managing existing transportation infrastructure through aggressive travel demand management strategies (carpool, vanpool, commuter bus, bike, telecommute, flex hours, congestion pricing tactics, incentives through employers).
- Needed shorter list of fully funded projects.
- What about bringing back the old ferry system?
- Work across jurisdiction lines before hand on the government/elected official level.
- Changing paradigms. Clark County is in transition from “good ole’ boys” system to a more inclusive enlightening system.
- Issue: land use vs. transportation support. Interest: always playing “catch up”.
- Land use / transportation integration: Oregon example to dissolve power struggles. Need balanced system that focuses on *quality of life*.
- Need more active neighborhood association representatives meeting on a countywide effort (e.g., local problems may affect county/city-wide/other neighborhoods).

Summit Exercise #2: *Big issues and big decisions on the horizon.*

I. Economic Development

- Clark County planning is not going to get any more billion-dollar projects if it does not improve roads! Clark County is years behind the planning for growth and traffic.
- Economic Development is at risk, which will necessitate more roads to move people to Oregon, rather than reducing the need.
- Fixing local / Clark County transportation woes would encourage local business investment, which could diminish Clark County’s dependence on Portland jobs and I-5 / I-205.
- Focus more on job possibilities of west arterial bypass bridge instead of I-5 only.
- This is a must for our future – economic development in Clark County will eliminate much of the need for travel to Oregon and light rail.
- Industrial development north (Ridgefield).

- Link jobs to transportation.
- I-5 transportation corridor directly impacts viability of Port of Vancouver's Gateway Industrial Area development, and the resultant creation of new family-wage employment in manufacturing.

II. Monorail

- Wouldn't a monorail like the one in Seattle cause less disruption to private property along the path?

III. I-5 Bridge

- I-5 enhancement won't work if Portland doesn't add more lanes. Would just create a worse bottleneck.
- The Washington / Oregon traffic problem cannot be solved by Washington. It is Oregon policy to keep the problem in order to keep the majority of the economy.
- Why no third bridge? We need to resolve capacity questions in I-5 and I-205 corridors, where current employment is located and threatened by congestion, first. Depending on location, imposes major change on Portland / Vancouver urban region.
- Tunnel to add to I-5 bridge.
- Need to know more about non I-5 bridge issues.
- The second bridge will be high priority after improving I-5 bridge (with L-Rail level). The I-5 bridge is a federal responsibility, NOT LOCAL!
- I-5 over the Columbia -- road jam a.m. and p.m. Must either join the jam or restrict travel time and visit duration.

IV. Third Bridge

- Don't do third bridge because the cost/benefit is very low. Too many displacements and too high a cost for relatively small capacity increase. Also, it can promote sprawl.
- Third bridge is a very bad idea. It will just encourage a lot of development and traffic on the Clark County side of where that bridge ends up. Also, studies show that building new roads or widening them doesn't reduce congestion.

- A third bridge will open up the congestion.
- Third bridge – too much resistance and coordination with Oregon.
 - Environmental
 - Difficult decisions in Portland (Forest Park, Beaverton)
- The connectivity costs on both sides of the river are prohibitive.
- Third bridge (why poor score): Need to educate on 1) ability of both Ports to join together to fund a freight-only bridge (Port Authority) toll; and 2) limit new bridge to area where sprawl can be handled.
- Will not serve most of the Clark County area well because it would increase capacity on one end of the county or the other. It also would increase the “sprawl” effect.
- Better investment would be in economic development/jobs/commercial and retail in Clark County, rather than a third bridge. Enhance/improve existing bridges along with the above.
- I’d oppose a third bridge if it went through the Vancouver lowlands and wildlife area – that’s one of our last remaining wildlife areas.
- Western bypass would move more freight.
- A third bridge would only increase current pollution. If you build it, they will drive.
- No third bridge because of land use effects – will just promote more houses!!
- If considered, it should be the east, not west. Best location may be from SR-14 in vicinity of Lady Island (at settlement ponds) south to Troutdale/Fairview Ave. east of Portland. Westside proposals encounter environmental problems and do not connect well to I-5.
- Third bridge revised western arterial. Connecting Vancouver to Wilsonville, Oregon.

V. Mass Transit

- Adequately fund public transportation – it’s a way to increase capacity on roadways and provide choices for mobility.
- Support mass transit.
- Before we look at the “logistics” of light rail, BRT, or expanding mass transit, look at ridership – who will use it.

- More rail-street car mass transit like Europe's communities.
- Commuter buses: They must have accommodations appropriate for middle/upper management personnel (leg room, comfortable, first-class sized seats).
- Focus transit on main routes; replace buses on secondary routes with Dial-A-Ride/taxi jitneys and bicycle facilities.
- Commuter rail to Camas/Battle Ground (ferry).
- Express bus vs. light rail – express bus service competes with light rail. The public should not be expected to pay for both.
- Develop systems and facilities to make use of alternate transportation modes convenient. Fewer cars reduce congestion and increase mobility.
- Size of public transit – van size, mid-large capacity buses. This would improve transit throughout the county.
- Investigate integrating school transport into mass transit system.
- Public transit in rural areas? The people do not generally support it since it is too costly per traveler and not convenient.
- Need on-call systems for elderly and youth, and when cars break down.
- Bus rapid transit is a very good idea!!! Let the buses control the stoplights; then they'd go faster.
- Close park & rides – C-Tran should use its urban routes to feed Portland commuter service. The former commuter service should be used to increase the frequency of urban service. Increased frequency makes connecting service viable and is a better use of public monies.
- Would it be worthwhile and more cost-effective to use smaller buses for those times and routes with lower ridership? (I.e., smaller vehicles get better gas mileage)

VI. Discovery Corridor

- Discovery Corridor will require new infrastructure spending while ignoring developable industrial land within the Urban Growth Boundary. Resources can be better used.
- Will it just become a “sea of housing” if industry doesn't come?

- Change existing law so economic development can be done along the entire Discovery Corridor – not limited to within the Urban Growth Boundary.

VII. Light Rail

- There is no land available along proposed light rail for business development.
- If jobs are important, why are we seriously considering light rail to Oregon? It's an efficient means to send jobs south.
- Europe model – lots of trains, rail commuter trains.
- Why is light rail a more popular form of transportation than bus? IMAGE (bus is for yuppies too), EXPRESS SERVICE (less stops).
- Yes, light rail needs top priority. Building more roads just creates more driving and increases air pollution.
- Light rail is not cost-effective here. The reason is people and jobs are spread too far away from central stations.
- Parcel the light rail option into more affordable pieces. Focus on the I-205 corridor (Fisher Landing Transit Center to Portland). Offer affordable long-term parking (for Portland) as a financing option. I-205 is the geo-political center of the county – not I-5! This more fairly offers the benefits to East County.
- Light rail improved property values dramatically in Portland. Houses near the light rail line are nearly half a million dollars now in value.
- I-5 or I-205 – which should/can support light rail?
- Light rail is an economical benefit to Oregon. It only makes Washington more dependent on Portland for JOBS!
- Quality of life – light rail will bring crime to Clark County from Oregon – as it has along the light rail routes in Oregon!!
- Light rail is an important component to the overall goal of mobility within the metro area. It offers capacity, flexibility, and the promise of economic expansion and development.
- Light rail is near airport – close to I-205. I think it could be done.

- Public transportation – I’ve ridden on subways in Washington D.C., New York City and Miami. Japan and Germany’s railways are great!
- Why not do a light rail across I-205 since it was built to accommodate it and have one stop for now? Could see demand.
- Quality of life (for those commuting to Portland) would be improved with light rail. This would attract more residents to Vancouver. Means more sales and property taxpayers.
- Light rail is a good idea. It moves more people faster and with less pollution.
- Light rail will not improve traffic congestion through Clark County; however, it will attract extensive private sector investment along proposed loop within Clark County. Of course, it will go to and from Portland. People will come to Clark County.
- The “light rail” concept should include dedicated bus ways.
- Light rail is very cost-effective moving large numbers of people. Current ridership does not support light rail. I support the concept of gradualism. First crawl, then walk, then run. I support light rail when ridership can support it.
- Light rail takes lots of land. At least look at monorail.
- The capacity of light rail is limited by its rate of travel through downtown Portland. Is this adequate to serve Clark County?

Summit Exercise #3: *What about transportation costs, spending and funding?*

I. Transportation Funding

- Federal funds in jeopardy without state commitment (\$ match). Federal funds are shifting (wartime concerns, etc.).
- New money – bicycle tax (lifetime \$10/bike purchase) – for bike education and maintenance of facilities (example: Hawaii).
- We are always playing catch up. In the future insist that all transportation dollars are justified by land use planning decisions.
- Fund, engineer and develop entire projects rather than small segments over several years – even though this means doing fewer projects in fewer locations. Segmenting projects creates a barrier to selling funding projects to the public and makes us look inefficient and wasteful in project development because the projects take so long.

- There is no overall transportation funding for roads and projects. It's each jurisdiction for itself.
- Fuel tax has stayed constant or dropped! Bottom line twice miles driven every ten years; constant – same tax revenue.
- Barriers – 1) federal and state restrictions on toll pricing / HOV (HOT) existing facilities; and 2) abandon gas tax, find new tools like congestion pricing to deal with future expansions.
- Luxury taxes on luxury items.
- Funding solutions must be comprehensive and include the true cost of the system on our society.
- If regional gas tax is used for things that a statewide-tax USED to pay for, is this a “Pandora’s Box?” What other state responsibilities become local?
- Tax Oregon workers who work in Clark County (set level to that of our lost wage earners in Oregon) and use this for transportation funding (as they do not pay property tax).
- Increase vehicle registration fees.
- User fees -- the more you drive, the more you pay. Toll bridges and highways are practical too.
- Income tax is fairer to people than sales tax. Install income tax but eliminate sales tax. Bring buyers back from Portland.
- Capital transportation projects generate economic growth.
- Public/private partnerships – 1) private funding of LRT / BRT transit stations (to include stores, shops); and 2) private funding of new I-5 bridge, to include housing (best views of the river).
- Railroads should carry more freight. Trucks should be taxed more.
- Redesign tax system.
- FHA, WDOT, US Census all have different definitions of urban, rural, etc.
- Promote local improvement districts as a funding option for neighborhood projects.
- Local option gas tax – keep 100% gas tax collected here in Clark County.

- The current funding system does not provide money for the current list of projects – how do we transform that system to one that works?
- Gap between rich and poor is increasing. We need tax reform, but the citizens won't go for it unless it is done with equitability and fairness. Especially under the Bush administration. High-income people aren't paying their fair share – why should the rest of us make it up for them?
- Series of new lottery games focused to transportation.
- Add sales tax on gasoline for purpose of funding public transit! This would not eliminate the need to increase the gas tax (not the sales tax) for road construction and maintenance, but it would directly support transit, and more vehicle usage would result in more dollars for transit.
- We need to be careful of “regionalization”. Let's begin to think as a statewide system.
- Sales tax in general is not fair in Clark County (poor can't afford). Gas tax or sales tax on gas where the money stays here would be better.
- Redesign tax system – three-legged stool. Income tax, property tax, and low sales tax. Taxes are the price you pay for a civilized society.
- If I were King of Clark County, I would raise the gas tax to pay for roads, mass transit, etc. We squander our energy. Gas tax needs to pay for mass transit to relieve congestion!
- Regional transportation funding: Intent of regional funding initiative should be to provide matching funds to partner with state and federal funds.
- Regional tax collection should support regional needs, and (doing that) may bring a more positive reaction from voters (e.g., light rail loop). State and federal tax dollars should make regional projects a reality and represent support from those outside the region who benefit from the projects.
- Public / private partnerships can help avoid low-bid requirements (may compromise quality, long range waste). “Look at lowest responsible bid.”
- Legislation restrictions discourage innovations.
- The idea of funding through a gas tax is not forward thinking. What happens as auto efficiency increases and we eventually introduce alternative fuels?
- Utility tax as a fair way of funding transportation.

- Fund public transit through utility taxes – a very good idea!!! With it, also fund bike lanes and bike facilities.
- We should tax gasoline to provide funds for public transportation. The use of gasoline is directly related to the amount of transportation used. It also provides a disincentive to drive alone.
- Revamp the state tax structure to pay for what is needed.
- The proposed tax program of William Gates. Seniors should be considered: 1) corporate sales tax at 5%; and 2) adjust income tax, plus an estate tax.
- Transportation problems will not be solved until the State of Washington overhauls its tax system. We now have a very regressive system that does not yield enough revenue to meet the needs for schools, social services, transportation, etc. The Gates report deserves adoption. This is the big challenge.
- Generate transportation revenue from miles-per-gallon rating of vehicles on a yearly basis to make those private non-business related vehicle owners conscious of the pollution and natural resource consumption. SUV's are mostly not purchased/driven out of "need" for their functionality.
- Our transportation system needs to be converted in its funding system and in people's perception to a utility → value priced.
- With decreased public funding available and the citizens' unwillingness to pay more taxes, we need to PRIORITIZE, putting BASIC NEEDS first.
- Funding for identified projects must have a sunset provision; tax increase must be discontinued when projects are completed.
- Funds may be generated through a regional body using current guidelines and legislation that will fund capital projects only. Current law prohibits regional entities from funding operations and maintenance of systems.
- Funding "out of the box". Auction driving times on congested routes on "E-Bay" – regulate by electronic system.
- Keep business in Clark County, not Portland/Oregon. Do away with sales tax in Clark County.
- Transportation organizations of all levels in this region DESPARATELY need to communicate better, and take on an active role in the education of the voting public. And, keep it SIMPLE. Focus on current expense levels by category (maintenance, improvements, new construction, etc.), and funding by source and amount (gas tax, sales

tax, property tax, etc.). Then we can start constructive discussions about needs of new funding.

- Public / private partnerships could also include moratoria and the lifting of them when extra from the development groups bring more \$\$ to the table.
- Bridge toll. Education. Building transit. Commuter rail.
- Toll Columbia River bridges to create revenue.
- I think we need to put tolls on both interstate bridges to pay for added capacity on the interstate system... including the light rail loop. That way those who benefit from the additional capacity help pay for it. Increased sales tax doesn't do that!
- Toll roads.
- Toll both bridges – both ways.
- Demand management systems. Tolls!
- Bridge tolls should be tax deductible or put on Sec. 125 programs. Talk to Baird.
- No toll bridge.

II. Transportation Spending

- We need a closer link between transportation projects and funding. People need a better understanding of what a project will cost them tax wise. Also, people do not want to pay for a “pig in a poke”.
- Utilize staff knowledge vs. outsiders / consultants. Managers know what can effectively be cut or somehow improved / optimized.
- Why do transportation projects cost so much?
- In seeking improvements in spending effectiveness, we need to trust our managers to work in developing ways to effectively spend our money and not look to outside consultants.
- Is the existing funding system workable? I do not think it is.
- We need to address transportation-specific regionalization to fund a specific list of projects.

- Eliminate waste, increase efficiencies, work cross systems.
- The system that is in place to bring all improvements to completion needs to be improved itself. Waste in the entire process of government itself is rampant, on all levels. Let's change the way the "game" is played.
- Projects take too long.
- SEPA – State Environmental Protection Agency tends to hold up projects, which creates loss of dollars. Cut red tape.
- Plan land use in conjunction with ability to provide efficient transit. Transit = where density is okay.
- Better coordination between jurisdictions for effectiveness. Map planned projects on Internet.
- Let the people doing the projects determine how to build most effectively (i.e., highway made from concrete or asphalt). Same life span given.

Why R-51 Failed

- Instead of focusing on why R-51 failed, we need to ask ourselves what can we do now? Start with small, specific projects. Initiate local gas tax with a 100% revenue. Assure people what will be done, how long it will take, and how long the tax is for.
- Who decides: Have the elected officials make the decisions they were elected to make.
- R-51 failed because of lack of information. I learned more from the figures presented at the 11/23 forum than all the voter information during the campaign! We should have been informed how far behind Washington is falling in highway funding. Why has gas tax not been increased since?
- The State of Washington has one of the highest gas taxes in the nation. Failure of R-51 should not stop funding of needed highway work.
- Legislators abandoned their responsibility to provide a solution.
- R-51 is the wrong tool (not gas tax). Not enough transit (50%). Too many half-built proposals.
- How much federal matching money did we lose with R-51? Can it be re-captured and how?

- Poorly defined project list – not well understood / known by voters.
- Analogy used to show why R-51 failed: Three Rivers Library – project explained, needs shown, funding discussed, local benefit to voters → PROJECT PASSED!
- R-51 – not proper tax structure. Anti-government, anti-tax attitude. Poor understanding of current funding vs. costs. Poor promotion. Poor current economy.
- Insufficient ROI.
- Distrust of government.
- The legislators passed the buck onto the voters rather than live up to their mandate.
- If we fund this now (R-51), will we be back in five years for “fix” it again?
- C-Tran fosters the perception that services can be provided and taxes capped or reduced by providing services that exceed revenues (C-Tran is currently using reserves to provide the level of existing service).
- Fully fund a project or three – not partial with government coming back six years later to ask for more...
- R-51 got voted down because 1) environmentalists didn't like it because it funded roads instead of public transit; 2) everyone else didn't like it because it involved a tax increase; so it made no one happy.
- R-51 failed because it was on the ballot. Transportation would have succeeded if the legislators had taken the responsibility and voted it in while they were in session.
- The average voter doesn't understand trade-offs.
- R-51 failed because of apathy; geographic equity concerns; other issues dominated; lack of trust between citizens and public entities; only looked at highway roads; citizens had to pay out of pocket .9 cents gas tax.
- The failure of R-51 is not what has caused the loss of federal matching funds! What has caused the loss of these funds is the elected government officials' failure to allocate existing tax revenues in the way the people want. There is enough money in the system to take care of roads without any tax increases. These federal funds could have been secured if elected officials were willing to make the hard financial decisions families like mine have had to make, spending money where it counts rather than courting special interest groups that you think got you elected. Can your government employees and elected officials hear the people or will you continue to keep your heads buried in the sand and blame us for your failures????

Summit Exercise #4: *What bold actions should we pursue now in order to better determine and shape our transportation future?*

I. Bold Actions – *General Comments*

- Increase the number of population who listen to transportation issues – not wait for the ONE MINUTE of their attention.
- Either partner or not – must choose and accept the agreed decision. Private vs. public.
- Participation in this exercise depends on having time to spend and information. Low-income folks work hard and have little time to spend in public forums and also don't always read the paper, so consequently are not informed.
- Need to expand the context of the conversation beyond just public transportation dollars to total transportation expenditures and personal choices.
- InterACT needs to take this program to other communities, i.e., King, Pierce, etc.
- If you really want to stir the pot, one bold action would be to assess how environmental issues impact cost – long term and/or short term.
- A better bold action – the Washington County (OR) model. See me if you aren't familiar with it. – *Ginger Metcalf*
- Street trees must be a part of the transportation system plan and maintenance solution.
- Most people in Clark County want more and wider roads, but don't want to pay for them. The problem may not be solvable. As an environmentalist, doing nothing is better than building more roads and encouraging more drivers.
- We're headed toward a brick wall. I don't see any way around this. People who like public transit tend to move to Portland and Portlanders who don't like the area's investment in public transit move to Clark County.
- Risk: need to preserve quality of life and clean air. Need to lessen time and/or distance of commutes.
- Awareness of fact that the number of vehicles registered doubles every ten years, fuel economy miles per gallon "Café" fleet MPG doubles – miles driven doubles!!
- How do we increase the number of persons / vehicles on the current road system?

- System is workable; system work needs funding; trust government; prioritize projects; systems broke; stop tinkering, seize a radical solution!
- We need the systems that must produce an outcome for fixing what's broken, mandated to come to the table and reduce non-effective spending.
- Architects and engineers need to plan for future transportation. Build bridges long enough for more lanes when needed. Require absolute cost bids without override allowance.
- TIPPIT project keeps getting shoved back – on Ward Road, the County's letting three people die a year because the road is not a high enough priority!
- Continued practice to constantly expand roadways only contributes to more traffic, causing need for even more roads.
- Esther Short Park's quality is severely reduced due to Portland Airport cutting across downtown Vancouver. Semi-truck traffic is heavy in and around downtown and park. Restrict these polluters absolutely.
- Every citizen must be able to walk to work, school, and shop from their home.
- What about an intensive carpool network effort, perhaps maintained by a government agency? This should be a positive step to lessen traffic (for those who object to buses, etc.).
- Why not bring back the jitney system to increase riders per vehicle?
- One tree ten years old to provide the oxygen for one car. We now have 200,000 cars in Clark County – we need street trees.
- Given the time lag in transportation projects, shouldn't we be thinking ONLY of where we want transportation to be at least five years or more in the future and NOT in terms of our immediate concerns?
- Develop the "Dream," as Deb Wallace suggested. Let's take baby steps to reach it. The Padden alignment was adopted in 1968 – it's now 2002 and in the final stage of construction!
- Stopping growth can be positive, and doesn't necessarily make an area die. Santa Barbara stopped growing 30 years ago and is thriving. It is so desirable a place to live that a three-bedroom house now goes for \$700,000 or more. We could just stop growth because it seems that the alternatives are too difficult and cost too much.
- Not transportation design alone; not politics alone; if we can't integrate. Good planning and good politics → informing → successful funding → needed results.

II. Bold Actions – *Education*

- There isn't enough concentration in high school on civics. Students are capable if exposed to and challenged by planning their future.
- All of these issues need to be clarified/explained in laymen's terms so the average everyday guy can make informed decisions and provide input, so ALL citizens have a voice.
- Get the word out house by house, apartment by apartment on how transportation is funded, how we set priorities. The dialogue needs to be in laymen's terms and provide opportunity for input.
- Education of voters – volunteer. Deliver a tight message, one-page with bullet points, cover transportation trends. To employers – pay stub information. Create more interest for discussion.
- Information does not reach voters, i.e., R-51 projects were not known by many voters – consequently, they voted no.
- Education should include cost/benefit analysis. Express in common units (\$) and ratios.
- Lack of education on the part of the public is real. Almost all my co-workers at H-P think government is greedy and unnecessary, and not one person who thinks this way would ever come to an event like this.

III. Bold Actions – *Legislators*

- What Mike said: There's much diversity of opinion relating to bureaucracy's value vs. abuse!
- Lack of trust between citizens and public entities. Overcome: discussion, education, proactive – neighborhood association meetings, churches, Rotary, library forums.
- “The Disconnect” – trust, involvement level. How can Clark County increase citizen involvement?
- Trust has become an essential pre-requisite to success in funding – votes. To gain trust, good system, planning and competent leadership → effective information out → trust.
- Send a message to our legislators... do the job we elected you to do. Disappointed in absence of state representatives and senators.

- Have more elected officials show up at public forums like this, and listen to other public, collective input.

III. Bold Actions – *Public Transportation*

- Older drivers who will soon be unable to drive – will they have sidewalks and transit to stay vital and allow them to age in place (keep their homes)?
- Every life activity for low income, elderly and disability members of our community will receive impact with the reduction of public transportation (training, vocation, medical, education, recreation, resident, food, community involvement).
- Social Services is paying huge sums to transport dependent people when this money could be used for public transportation alternatives.
- Mobility – choices and access are important. Current funding trends will eliminate/reduce options (i.e., public transportation dollars).
- Mobility, or lack of, is an aspect of all the other transportation aspects, i.e., economic development, quality of life, etc.
- Inside the city limits, there are many sidewalks in disrepair. There are sidewalks on major routes that do not have curb cuts. There are curb cuts that are poorly designed, deeper than 1” – scooter wheels cannot navigate. Would gladly pay higher taxes if it meant I could get around easier.
- C-Tran’s Board acted on 11/19 authorizing staff to develop a 20-year plan that incorporates the findings of TPP. Kudos for Board.
- Use railroad lines up to center of County North.
- Commuter rail using existing rail lines – Woodland to Portland, with stops and park & ride along the way.
- We need to really look at making the most of what’s already there and what we already have, like using the existing rail lines in the county more and tying them together with effective bus service.
- The right-of-way for Chelatchie Railroad can be used for transit from North County. It could be used for either train or light rail, or a different mode of transit, which are newer concepts.
- Look at public agencies (small) to not be applicable to Davis Bacon Law.

Comments on Summit

- Having these summits all day Saturday is a good idea, especially in the fall and winter. Often, I don't have the time and energy to attend these on a weeknight, but it is easier to set aside a Saturday.
- I think disabled and low-income people have been under-represented at these forums, primarily because they probably had no way to get to them. Some effort should be made to gather input from this segment of the community.
- By 1:15 pm the buzz in the room showed you were losing the crowd except for the polling and the panel presentation. The first hour of introductions was too long. And allowing so many comments took too much time. All in all – a good meeting that took too long!
- Questions were vague, not narrow enough?
- What can be done to increase/expand the demographic makeup of this summit? Is this “makeup” measured at the different meetings?
- I feel like I need more information, facts and figures. How does Clark County compare with rest of the state? How does Washington compare with rest of the country? How do various parts of the transportation system work? How does transportation funding work? Where do funding sources come from? Who currently pays what portion of each of these sources?
- Some of the questions were so broad and the terms so vague, it was hard to prioritize or answer the questions, i.e., what does “reduce bureaucracy and regulatory red tape” mean?
- I would have like to have had handout material available for everybody.
- Identity Clark County and InterACT have done a wonderful job of pulling TPP together and I think we ought to get it into other counties.